

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-18 were pending at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 have been amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Thus, claims 1-18 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objection:

Claims 7 and 13 are objected to because of informalities. The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection:

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to define the invention. The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis. The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection:

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,076,540 to Kurose et al. (hereinafter “Kurose”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, the Office Action states that claims 1-18 are rejected, but only sets out a rejection for claims 1 and 7. The Examiner asserts that certain phrases utilized in the claims would not be given patentable weight, but even those claims (such as 3, 9 and 15) that do not contain those limitations do not have prior art rejections associated. However, there is no

indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Thus, further clarification is requested as to the Examiner's scope of rejection.

Second, Kurose does not meet the limitations of the independent claims, so even if citations were made towards the other claims currently presented in the application, those citations would not meet the features of the invention as claimed. The invention, as claimed in the independent claims, deals with a router that transmits a verification message from a transmission host to a reception host, and then monitors the response to determine if the reception host supports a reservation protocol. In the cited passages of the Office Action, there is no teaching that communication occurs between transmission and reception hosts. Rather, a service-request-compatible apparatus receives a network-service request, and provides that service. The network-information-collecting means collects information on the service-provision state from the service-request-compatible apparatus and supplies that information to the target-apparatus-determination means and service-mapping means. These two means determine a service-request-incompatible apparatus and a service which should be set in the apparatus. (column 5, lines 45-67; column 6, lines 1-40) There is no indication, in this cited section, or anywhere else in the disclosure of Kurose, that communication occurs and is monitored between the transmission and reception hosts. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that this communication is monitored and utilized to make judgments on the protocols the reception host is able to support. Claims 2, 8, and 14 specifically delineate the type of message monitored between the hosts (an internet control message protocol message). There is no mention or teaching in Kurose of such a message, let alone the utilization of such a message to determine the capabilities of a reception host.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a resource reservation protocol substitute reply router, comprising "judgment means for monitoring a response message from said reception host for said verification message and making a judgment whether said reception host is an equipment supporting said resource reservation protocol or not." (Similar language appears in independent claims 7 and 13.) As shown above, Kurose does not teach communication between a transmission and reception host, let alone an ability to monitor messages from one host to another and make judgments on the protocols the reception host is able to support. Thus, if this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where this feature is disclosed in Kurose.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. As mentioned above, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding the application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 10, 2007

By Ramya Ananthanarayanan (Reg. 59597)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6059
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59597